

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 are pending in this application. Claims 24-32 and 53 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 15, 21, 23-24, 33, 47, and 53 are independent. In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 15 to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment is being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 15, 23, 33 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Preliminary Comments

Applicant wishes to thank Supervisor Andrew Fisher for the telephone conference of October 18, 2006. During the telephone conference, the parties agreed that should Applicant amend claim 15 as recited herein, and should Applicant include arguments against the 35 U.S.C. §112, and 101 rejections, as set forth herein, that the outstanding rejections would be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 15, 23, 33, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, asserting that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term "position coding pattern." The Examiner further asserts that it is not clear what the Applicant means by a "position coding pattern."

Applicant respectfully submits that in each of the rejected claims, noted term is introduced as “a position coding pattern.” As such, Applicant respectfully submits that there is sufficient antecedent basis for this term.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the term is definite on its face as the term “position coding pattern” is well-known. For example, the Examiner’s attention is directed to U.S. Patent No. 5,661,506 wherein the term “position coding pattern” is discussed. Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would appreciate the meaning of the term “position coding pattern” and, as such, Applicant submits that the term is definite. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 15 asserting they are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertions.

Claim 1 is directed to method wherein two method steps are recited. In addition, claim 1 clearly provides for a useful, concrete and tangible result, i.e., the valuable document. As a method is one of the statutory categories set forth in 35 U.S.C. §101, and, as the method clearly recites a useful, concrete and tangible result, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 15 to indicate that the computer performs the checking and the providing steps. As claim 15 recites a method that provides a useful, concrete and tangible result, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is directed to statutory subject matter. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

As the Examiner has not cited any prior art against the pending claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are now in proper form for allowance.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: November 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No. 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant


MKM/CMV/ec